



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/804,806	03/19/2004	Andreas S. Krebs	6631P010	8888
8791 7590 08/29/2008 BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP 1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040				
EXAMINER				
CHEUNG, VICTOR				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3714				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/29/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/804,806

Applicant(s)

KREBS ET AL.

Examiner

VICTOR CHEUNG

Art Unit

3714

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 May 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 12-20 and 22-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12-20 and 22-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to Applicant's reply, filed 05/28/2008.

Claims 12-20 and 22-30 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 12-20 and 22-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Owens et al. (US Patent No. 6,315,572) in view of Sadhwani-Tully (US Patent No. 6,785,822), Griffin et al. (US Patent No. 6,917,975), and Bahrs et al. (US Patent No. 6,862,686).

Re Claims 12, 15, 22, and 25: Owens et al. disclose an authoring tool to structure and create a computer based training course, the authoring tool including a instructional design role (Fig. 8) and a content definition role (Figs. 9-12) (Fig. 13, "Lesson Data" and "Relevant Data"). The authoring tool includes a plurality of functions, tools, buttons, etc., as seen in figures 8-11. The authoring tool is also encoded on a machine readable medium (Col. 25, Lines 29-30). Owens et al. disclose using lists and menus to present items (Fig. 3-10).

However, Owens et al. do not specifically disclose that the functions are allocated via a role allocation module and a function allocation module, wherein the role selection is made by the user, and that the functions are selected by the user. Owens et al. do not specifically disclose storing a set

of allocation data for each function including allocation settings for each of an instructional design role and a content definition role for the user to assume, each allocation setting indicating an ability of the respective function to be allocated to the respective role.

Sadhwani-Tully disclose a system and method for role based configuration of user profiles, including a role allocation module (Fig. 4, Ref. 402) and a function allocation module (Fig. 4, Ref. 408, 410, 412, 418) for allocating functions to each of the roles ("Profiles") by an administrator. Functions are presented in a list (Fig. 4).

Griffen et al. disclose that administrative capabilities such as customizing or personalizing user interface elements can be delegated and distributed to users with inferior roles to the primary administrators (Col. 10, Lines 1-19).

Bahrs et al. disclose a role based permissions system in an application including storing a set of permission data for each capability that a user is potentially able to perform based on roles, thus enabling or disabling functions, buttons, applications, and GUI components (Col. 61, Lines 5-42).

It is inherent of a configuration system such as that of Sadhwani-Tully to include memory to store selections and preferences of the user.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include modules to customize the functions available to users under specific roles or profiles, thereby ensuring that the user is presented only with the functions the user requires or has access to.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the user with the role allocation and function allocation modules such that the system administrator's number of tasks to be responsible for is reduced.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to store a set of settings for each role defining and indicating an ability of the role to have functions, buttons, and components available to the user of the system as taught by Owens, Sadhwani-Tully, and Griffin, thus achieving the predictable result of preventing users/roles from accessing and allocating functions they should not have access to.

Re Claims 13 and 23: Owens et al., in view of Sadhwani-Tully, Griffen et al., and Bahrs et al., teach the limitations of claim 1 above.

However, Owens et al. do not specifically teach the function allocation module allocating default sets of instructions.

Sadhwani-Tully teaches that the functions may be set to be the default functions (Fig. 4, Ref. 426; Col. 6, Lines 20-22).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to create default sets of functions such that the user is not required to run the function allocation modules each time the user wishes to regularly use a specific set of functions.

Re Claims 14 and 24: Owens et al., in view of Sadhwani-Tully, Griffen et al., and Bahrs et al., teach the limitations of claim 1 above.

However, Owens et al. do not specifically teach disallowing of sets of functions to the roles.

Sadhwani-Tully teaches that by granting functionality to a set of functions, the module is consequently limiting access functionality from specific groups or users (Col. 1, Lines 49-52).

Re Claims 16 and 26: Owens et al., in view of Sadhwani-Tully, Griffen et al., and Bahrs et al., teach the limitations of claim 15 above.

However, Owens et al. do not specifically teach presenting in a first distinct display area a list of functions for selective allocation to only one of the instructional design role and a content definition role, the method further comprising presenting in a second distinct display area a second list of one or more functions in the set of functions for selective allocation to only the other of the instructional design role and a content definition role, the displaying in the distinct first and second display areas in conjunction with a graphical user-selection mechanism so as to facilitate graphical selection of the first and second sets of functions by a user.

Sadhwani-Tully teaches presenting allocatable sets of functions for user selection for the plurality of roles (Fig. 4-5A; Col. 6, Line 38 – Col. 7, Line 7). Each role/profile has an associated set of functions that are displayed distinctly from the other role/profile (“action group”, Col. 6, Lines 52-54).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to present the sets of functions for user selection such that the user may easily select the functions to be allocated.

Re Claims 17 and 27: Owens et al. disclose the use of check boxes in an interface (Col. 21, Lines 49-52).

Owens et al. disclose displaying information in windows of a graphical user interface (Fig. 2-10).

Examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE that the use of check boxes is well known in the art as one of the many methods to providing user input in any system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use check boxes in the graphical user-selection mechanism, providing the user with a simple method to select a plurality of items.

Re Claims 18-20 and 28-30: Note that claims 18-20 are drawn to the limitations of a GUI customization module that share similar characteristics of the functions of claims 1-6 and 12-17, respectively.

Sadhvani-Tully teaches the GUI module to customize a display of functions to the user based on a user role (as in claim 18), selectively displaying user-selectable indicia only for functions allocated to the user role (as in claim 19), and displaying the user-selectable indicia within at least one of a drop-down menu, a pop-up menu, and function tabs within the GUI (as in claim 20). See figures 4-6B.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Barkley et al. (USPN 6,202,066), High, Jr. et al. (USPN 7,124,192), and Van Dyke et al. (USPN 6,412,070) each disclose computing environments wherein rights and accessibility to functions and objects are allowed or denied based on roles.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VICTOR CHEUNG whose telephone number is (571)270-1349. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 9-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Pezzuto can be reached on (571) 272-6996. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/V. C./
Examiner, Art Unit 3714

/XUAN M. THAI/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3714